

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
MACON DIVISION

JOSEPH ANTHONY GITTENS,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
VS.	:	
	:	<b>5 : 20-CV-456 (MTT)</b>
WARDEN MORALES, <i>et al.</i> ,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

**ORDER**

Pending is Plaintiff's Motion for Appointment of Counsel. (Doc. 32). Generally speaking, no right to counsel exists in §1983 actions. *Wahl v. McIver*, 773 F.2d 1169, 1174 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1985); *Hardwick v. Ault*, 517 F.2d 295, 298 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1975); *Mekdeci v. Merrel Nat'l. Lab.*, 711 F.2d 1510, 1522 n.19 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1983). Appointment of counsel is a privilege that is justified only by exceptional circumstances. *Lopez v. Reyes*, 692 F.2d 15, 17 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1982); *Branch v. Cole*, 686 F.2d 264, 266 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1982); *Ulmer v. Chancellor*, 691 F.2d 209 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1982).

In deciding whether legal counsel should be provided, the Court typically considers, among other factors, the merits of the Plaintiff's claim and the complexity of the issues presented. *See Holt v. Ford*, 862 F.2d 850, 853 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1989). Applying the standards set forth in *Holt*, it appears that at the present time, the essential facts and legal doctrines in this case are ascertainable by the Plaintiff without the assistance of court-appointed legal counsel and that the existence of exceptional circumstances has not been shown by the Plaintiff. The Court on its own motion will consider assisting Plaintiff in securing legal counsel if and when it becomes apparent that legal assistance is required. Accordingly, Plaintiff's Motion

for Appointment of Counsel is **DENIED**. (Doc. 32).

**SO ORDERED**, this 14th day of October, 2021.

s/ *Thomas Q. Langstaff*  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE